

LINK:

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.	CV 15-06141-BRO (GJSx)	Date	May 25, 2016
----------	-------------------------------	------	--------------

Title	DERRICK SOTELO V. WAL-MART, INC. ET AL
-------	---

Present: The Honorable	BEVERLY REID O’CONNELL, United States District Judge
------------------------	---

Renee A. Fisher	Not Present	N/A
-----------------	-------------	-----

Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter	Tape No.
--------------	----------------	----------

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:	Attorneys Present for Defendants:
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Not Present	Not Present
-------------	-------------

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: FAILURE TO OPPOSE

Pending before the Court is Defendant Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.’s Motion for Summary Judgment. (Dkt. No. 20.) Defendant filed its Motion on April 25, 2016, noticing a hearing date of June 13, 2016. (*Id.*) Under the Central District’s Local Rules, a party must oppose a motion at least twenty-one (21) days prior to the scheduled hearing date. C.D. Cal. L.R. 7-9. Accordingly, Plaintiff Derrick Sotelo’s Opposition to Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment was due no later than May 23, 2016. As of today’s date, Plaintiff has filed no opposition. Although a Motion for Summary Judgment “may not be granted solely based on the failure to file an opposition,” C.D. Cal. L.R. 7-12, the Court **ORDERS Plaintiff TO SHOW CAUSE** as to why the Court should not grant Defendant’s Motion. **Both (1) Plaintiff’s response to this Order,¹ and (2) Plaintiff’s opposition to the Motion for Summary Judgment, if any, shall be filed by no later than Wednesday, June 1, 2016, at 4:00 p.m.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer

rf

¹ An appropriate response to this Order will include reasons demonstrating good cause for Plaintiff’s failure to file an opposition to Defendant’s Motion.